



## REMARKS

Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. In the prior response, Applicants filed one and one-half pages of amendments to the claims to correct the errors found in the claims. Accordingly the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his remarks that applicant failed to amend the claims. The reference to the Trademark Florinert 113 was cancelled in the prior amendment. The Examiner is requested to ascertain that the cancellation was in fact made on his copy of the application.

Applicants acknowledge that the structures need to be modified. They will make the necessary changes when the application is allowed.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of claims 1-5, 8, 9-12 and 17-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Jonas (U.S. 4,902,573).

The Examiner is requested to supplement this rejection as the basis for the rejection under sections 102 and 103 of the statute is not clear. The references are not applied. For a claim, such as claim 1 to be anticipated, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed in the reference. Jonas does not teach a blend using a solvent, and clearly does not recognize that the polymer in the solvent is characterized by a dependence of the electrical conductivity of the electrically conductive polymer on the concentration of the polymer in the solvent. Applicants emphasize and clearly state that the concentration is selected to maximize the electrical conductivity. Jonas does not teach or imply this concept.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of claims 1-4, 9-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Traynor (U.S. 4,629,798).

The Examiner's statement that the "Rejection is maintained for reason of record and of above" is not a sufficient basis for rejecting the claims. The only "record" above is the reference to the Jonas patent. Further elucidation of the application of the references is requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Ikenaga et al. (U.S. 4,772,421).

Again, the Examiner's statement that the "Rejection is maintained for reason of record and of above" is not a sufficient basis for rejecting the claims. Further elucidation of the application of the references is requested. The Ikenaga et al. reference, alone or in combination, does not teach suggest, prove motivation for or incentive for the claims as presently written calling for a blend using a solvent and clearly does not recognize that the polymer in the solvent is characterized by a dependence of the electrical conductivity of the electrically conductive polymer on the concentration of the polymer in the solvent.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of claims 1-4, 9-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Tan, et al. (U.S. 5,863,658).

The Examiner's statement that the "Rejection is maintained for reason of record and of above" is not a sufficient basis for rejecting the claims. Further elucidation of the application of the references is requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over EP 0315514.


The Examiner's statement that the "Rejection is maintained for reason of record and of above" is not a sufficient basis for rejecting the claims. Further elucidation of the application of the references is requested.


The polymer in the present invention is in a solvent and is characterized by a real dependence of the electrical conductivity of the electrically conductive polymer on the concentration of the polymer in the solvent. The concentration is critical as it is selected to maximize the electrical conductivity.

In view of the arguments, allowance of this case is warranted. Such favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 8, 2000

  
Thomas A. Beck  
Registration No. 20,816  
26 Rockledge Lane  
New Milford, CT 06776  
Telephone (860) 354-0892

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on the date indicated below with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail addressed to Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231  
Signature:  Date: May 8, 2000

Name:

Thomas A. Beck